

The FCC must reclassify broadband as a "telecommunications service" so that it can keep the Internet open and free of corporate gatekeepers.

Without vital Net Neutrality protections and the ability to enforce them, the Internet will cease to be a public platform for free speech, equal opportunity, economic growth and innovation. Instead, companies like AT&T, Verizon and Comcast, which have a commercial incentive to limit the free-flowing Web, will decide whose voices are heard.

You still have the power to protect the public interest. Please stand with us and keep the Internet in the hands of the people who use it every day.

What regulatory sense would make it possible for the telephone company to have the right to decide that if I dialed the number of Fred's Fast and Efficient Plumbing Service or any other plumber that they could connect me to Joe The Plumber instead? Because Joe The Plumber paid them a bribe? What right do Internet access providers have that if I wanted to watch the news online that FOX news would be allowed on demand while all others would be difficult or impossible to connect to and their feed slowed to the point it would take all day and several attempts to get a complete program. Because only FOX would pay the blackmail fee for unfettered throughput?

There are many laws on the books that say a supposedly independent persons in positions of responsibility can not take kickbacks or have any other financial interests with businesses or service providers to prevent even the appearance of collision between those parties to whom they direct another for a profit making sale or service. Yet those who already profit handsomely as Internet access providers also argue that shady deals and even blackmail must be a foundational element in their business model before they will allow those seeking information, among other things, to pass over their networks. That if they are not allowed to shamelessly demand additional profit over and above that made in providing that network somehow their right to collect obscene amounts of money by manipulating availability and quality to some (such as not slowing those that do pay beyond basic access fees or sending fake disconnect or could not connect messages) is infringing on their right to uninhibited greed. And all of this done through hidden manipulation intended to conceal from the person paying for that service that they are not getting what they are paying for. How would it be any different that the telephone companies being allowed to decide who you could call or who could call you or giving clearer and faster connection to those who paid extra but giving a low quality barely usable connection to those that refused to be blackmailed based on hidden manipulation based on content of the call or how long the conversation might last while doing so without the knowledge or consent of the person that was led to believe they were paying for the connection not to whom they could call or be called by or what the content of the conversation could be.

Because the establishment media provides such poor and often biased reporting of information I, for

simple survival, depend almost entirely upon the Internet for that information. I would find it extremely disturbing to find out that my Internet provider was willfully and legally manipulating who I could get that information from and consider it an outright violation of my constitutional right of free speech were they to prevent the communication of my thoughts and ideas to others, to have the form and quality of connection that others are provided without arbitrary manipulation based on content or whether they would have to invest more to provide equal service to all. That many of the limitations they have placed and intend to place on some uses and users of the service are hidden and many of the attempts to favor some users and limit or block entirely some uses and users based entirely on their idea of how to extort additional money from those that want to use it in ways t!

That prove they need to invest more to provide a usable service not that it is being used for the wrong purpose.. That their business model is one of claiming everything charged is their pure profit and nothing is for investment into providing the service they are charging for. That simply because they do not want to sacrifice what they consider profit to actually handle all they have contracted to provide service for they have a right to refuse service to those that are paying for that service without informing them they are paying for a service they are actually being refused. That it is their prerogative to limit or prevent some from using what they are paying for while trying to hide that they are preventing those who pay for the service from actually using it. If such use were not limited or blocked it would reveal only that the providers are simply enrolling more people claiming they will provide service while at the same time refusing to invest enough in the service t!

o justify the number of people they are enrolling and charging!

and doi

ng so through hidden manipulation by content. It is no different than a telephone company that would secretly provide a ringing signal to certain customers while intentionally not putting through the call through to conceal that certain customer were being disconnected because they their connection the telephone network they were paying for more than the telephone company thought they should because the telephone company after charging and connecting too many people to the exchange than it could handle decided they needed the fees for profit rather than investing in an exchange that could handle everyone that had been enrolled and was being charged. To be rewarded for intentionally overloading their own network and cutting or limiting some who are paying for the service by hidden manipulation based entirely on how the corporation can game what they have done into even greater profit claiming it is a finite resource when the only thing finite about it is the companies vision!

of how to wring ever more money from the people without providing the service they are charging for.

No Internet provider should have no access to the content of Internet traffic beyond that necessary for the efficient operation and management of the network. Any intentional use of content, use or user for corporate gain should be prohibited. Charges for connection and access should not entitle the provider to spy on who is using that connection or for what purpose. It should and must be considered a carrier only of information, not the sole and final judge of who may communicate on the network,

how they communicate or or what they communicate about. The Internet must remain open and neutral in access and content without hidden manipulation by corporate interests.